



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,420	05/29/2001	Mitsuru Ohkubo	205625US0CONT	6383

22850 7590 08/19/2002

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAJER & NEUSTADT PC
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, BINTA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/865,420

Applicant(s)

OHKUBO ET AL.

Examiner

Binta M. Robinson

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-20 and 22-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/495,572.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.


DETAILED ACTION

The improper Markush rejection of claims 1-20 and the 112, first paragraph rejection of claim 15 for the term "Use", as well as the 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-20 are withdrawn in light of applicant's remarks at paper no. 11/B. The first paragraph rejection of claim 15 is withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment at paper no. 11/B.

(new rejection)


1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-14, 16-20, 22-38 in part are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, is not enabling for R1 equal to all N-containing cycloalkyl groups which may have one or more suitable substituents, all  moieties, and the treatment of the various unrelated diseases claimed in claim 17. Pharmaceutical drugs usually treat, not prevent disease. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims as recited are broader than the scope of enablement. The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. The applicant is referred to

In re Wands, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in *Ex parte* Foreman 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is “undue”. These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In *re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In the present case regarding factor 1, the breadth of the claimed invention encompasses R1 equal to a N-containing cycloalkyl, which may have one or more suitable substituents, and a  moiety, which is an N-containing heterocyclic group, which may have one or more suitable substituents. However, the examples in the specification do not encompass the entire scope of the Markush groups claimed. In regards to factor 2, the nature of the invention cannot be determined in light of the foregoing and without knowing the exact therapeutic compounds and/or generic core structures of those compounds/compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents that are comprised in the claimed pharmaceutical composition; only the compound of example 21 on page 47, line 30 of the specification, was tested to show the utility of the

Art Unit: 1625

invention. The compound of example 21 is not representative of the entire scope of the Markush group claimed in claim 1, especially concerning R1 or the N-containing heterocyclic group with regard to its platelet aggregation properties.

In terms of factor 3 and 5, the state of the art and the level of predictability in the art cannot be predicted with any certainty beyond what specific test compounds /compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents should be used and are likely to provide productive results beyond those therapeutic compounds/compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents taught in the specification. Only example 21 was tested for its affect on platelet aggregation.

In terms of factors 4 and 6, the inventor provides no guidance beyond the therapeutic compound/compositions and/or therapeutic agents as taught in the specification as previously mentioned. As a result one of ordinary skill in the art could not predict what other types of therapeutic compounds/compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents, other than those taught in the specification; and with regards to the 7th and 8th Wands factor, while the existence of working examples are limited to the aforementioned compounds/compositions as taught in the specification (example 21), an indeterminate quantity of experimentation would be necessary to determine all potential therapeutic compounds/compositions' effects on platelet aggregation and actual diseases claimed in claim 17.

In terms of the 8th Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of predictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of

Art Unit: 1625

direction provided by the inventor. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

(Response to Applicant's Remarks) – the 112, first paragraph rejection

The applicant alleges that R1, R2, R3, A1, A2, and A3 substituents are enabled, because their values are fully disclosed on pages 14, line 1 to page 29, line 12.

However, listing the values for these radicals does not enable these radicals. The claimed values for radicals R1, R2, R3, A1, A2, and A3 are not enabled according to In re Wands and Ex parte Foreman. The applicant has only provided one working example of the invention which is example 21. One example is not representative of the broad breadth in scope claimed by radicals R1, R2, R3, A1, A2, and A3. Example 21 does not enable for example A1 equal to optionally substituted 3 to 8 membered heteromonocyclic groups containing 1 to 4 nitrogen atom (s). Undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of predictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by the inventor.

3. The elected species of claim 21 is allowable.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binta M. Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5437. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alan Rotman can be reached on (703)308-4698. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7922 for regular communications and (703)308-7922 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0193.

Binta Robinson



August 14, 2002



ALAN L. ROTMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600